DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 401 957 JC 960 695

AUTHOR More, Vishwas D.; Petrossian, Alice S.
TITLE The New Basic Agenda: Policy Directions for Student Success.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE Aug 96
NOTE 28p.; For the original 1991 Basic Agenda, see ED 332 768.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Administration; *Community Colleges; Educational Change; *Educational Policy; *Educational Quality; Educational Technology; School Business Relationship; Sociocultural Patterns; Student Financial Aid; Student Needs; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California Community Colleges

ABSTRACT

In response to the rapidly changing environment of the state of California, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (CCCs) developed the Basic Agenda in 1991 to convey the vision of the state's community colleges and provide broad direction at the systemwide and local levels. This report provides the New Basic Agenda, reflecting recent trends and identifying major challenges to successful student learning and policy directives to address these challenges. Following prefatory materials, the report address the following challenges and policy directions for the CCCs: (1) delivering high quality education in a manner that achieves student success; (2) meeting the expanding educational needs of the state population; (3) adapting to the changing educational needs of Californians so as to be relevant and timely; and (4) enhancing and improving the organization of the human and physical infrastructure of the CCCs. For each challenge, specific policy directions are presented, including the implementation of degree and certificate reviews; methods for measuring student educational objectives and performance; enrollment management; methods for determining the learning needs of an increasingly multicultural population; expanded technology in the classrooms; and initiatives to strengthen the transfer function. (TGI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 401 957

The New Basic Agenda

Policy Directions for Student Success

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Board of Governors
California Community Colleges

JC 960 695

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The New Basic Agenda

Preface

Dramatic changes are occurring in the workplace and in the basic social fabric and demography of California. Consequently, the skills and knowledge individuals need to lead productive and satisfying lives are changing in significant ways. As the primary provider of postsecondary education in the state, community colleges need to adapt to this rapidly changing environment so their services are relevant, timely, and effective. To do this, there must be a long-range vision, an agenda, and an implementation plan.

This *New Basic Agenda* of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges is intended to convey that vision, providing broad direction at both the systemwide level and for the 106 local community colleges. *Successful student learning*, so essential to California's development, is our basic theme and the *Agenda* identifies several major challenges and a series of policy directions to address these challenges. Some of the directions are existing policy, while others are new and will require further study and consultation before specific policies are recommended.

Development of this *Agenda* illustrates the merit of our new consultation process, in which the stakeholders in the community college system: board members, faculty, staff, students, citizens, and taxpayers all have input into policy development. Specific work on the *Agenda* began with an analysis or scan of California's emerging environment. The Board then studied these trends in depth to identify their implications for community college education. Following that, findings of this study were reviewed through the consultation process to secure input from those who ultimately will undertake the practices that are needed to implement the *Agenda*.

The Board of Governors would like to acknowledge several of the many contributors to this project. Joe Dolphin, former Board President, and Shirley Ralston, former Board member, initiated the work. Judy Walters, Vice Chancellor of Policy Analysis and Development, devised and directed the process; Chuck McIntyre, Director of Research, performed the environmental scan, background analysis and writing; and David Viar, Executive Director of the Community College League of California, led the consultation task force that helped determine the *Agenda's* format and much of its substance.

The Board hopes this *New Basic Agenda* will be the genesis of a new beginning. As part of its responsibility for systemwide leadership and coordination, the Board will revisit the *Agenda* annually to ensure that its contents are timely and relevant.

Vishwas D. More, *President*
Board of Governors
California Community Colleges

Alice S. Petrossian, *Vice President*
Board of Governors
California Community Colleges

The New Basic Agenda

Policy Directions for Student Success

Adopted March 1996 and Printed August 1996

Board of Governors

Robert A. Alleborn, *Newport Beach*
Yvonne Bodle, *Ventura*
Ryan Carrigan, *San Bernardino*
Philip E. del Campo, *San Diego*
Joe Dolphin, *San Diego*
Paul Kim, *Los Angeles*
Thomas F. Kranz, *Los Angeles*
Vishwas D. More, *Orinda*
Alice S. Petrossian, *Glendale*
John W. Rice, *Palo Alto*
Roger M. Schrimp, *Oakdale*
Rosemary E. Thaker, *San Francisco*
Larry Toy, *Orinda*
Julia Li Wu, *Los Angeles*

Officers of the Board

Vishwas D. More, *President*
Alice S. Petrossian, *Vice President*
Joe Dolphin, *Past President*
Philip E. del Campo, *California Postsecondary Education Commission Representative*
John W. Rice, *California Postsecondary Education Commission Alternate*

Governor of California

Pete Wilson

Office of the Chancellor

Thomas J. Nussbaum, *Acting Chancellor*
Ernest R. Leach, *Deputy Chancellor*

James Albanese
Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Policy

Ralph Black
Acting General Counsel

Rita Cepeda
Vice Chancellor for
Curriculum and Instructional Resources

Gus Guichard
Vice Chancellor for Governmental Relations

Vice Chancellor for
Economic Development and Vocational Education

Vice Chancellor for Management Information Services

Vice Chancellor for College Relations

José Peralez
Vice Chancellor for Equity and Diversity

Thelma Scott-Skillman
Vice Chancellor for
Student Services and Special Programs

Judy E. Walters
Vice Chancellor for Policy Analysis and Development

For information about the Board of Governors,
call or write
Linda Lucero-Maes, Assistant to the Board
Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges
1107 Ninth Street
Sacramento, California 95814-3607
(916) 445-6206

The California Community Colleges
are equal opportunity institutions.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Contents

Challenges and Policy Directions 1

Challenge 3

California Community Colleges must deliver high quality education in a manner that achieves student success

Challenge 9

California's future depends on its community colleges meeting the expanding educational needs of its population

Challenge 13

California Community College education must adapt to the changing educational needs of Californians so as to be relevant and timely

Challenge 19

The human and physical infrastructure of California Community Colleges must be enhanced, better organized, and better utilized

The New Basic Agenda

Challenges and Policy Directions

The Board intends that this *Basic Agenda* serve as a guide for policymaking during the last half of the 1990s—to the turn of the century. However, as part of its ongoing responsibility for long-range planning, the Board plans to revisit this *Agenda* as often as necessary to ensure that its contents are relevant and important. This planning responsibility involves the Board taking timely positions on issues that involve risk and that have future consequences for the system of community colleges in California.

Implementing this *Agenda* involves a substantial commitment to student learning and student success. This commitment requires the cooperation of many stakeholders—taxpayers, legislators, trustees, faculty, staff, and students. Supportive public policy is necessary, but not entirely sufficient for student success. Of even greater importance are the positive incentives that motivate faculty and the requisite rewards for responsible students that make up an effective learning environment. The Board's vision of improved student success will be achieved only through the diligent efforts of a comprehensive partnership of all those involved in community college education.

Implications of the changes taking place in California that are most important for community colleges are described as **challenges** below. These four challenges are varied and difficult. In each case, the discussion identifies the major **policy directions** that the Board thinks are important in meeting that challenge. Some of these directions are reaffirmations of **existing policy**. Other directions or problems are presented as **issues** since there is agreement on their importance, but not necessarily on the best policy or practice for their effective resolution. It is expected that the problems underlying these issues will be further reviewed and refined, and their policy resolution will go forward in the ***Consultation Process***.

The directions of this *New Basic Agenda* form the building blocks or context from which specific policies may be developed, analyzed, and endorsed through the usual consultation and decision making processes. Moreover, the Board hopes that these challenges and directions may serve as a compendium of useful references for local trustees, faculty, staff and students as they go about their work of making policy for and operating their college(s).

Challenge

California Community Colleges must deliver high quality education in a manner that achieves student success

Future community college students will need increasing attention paid to their diverse learning styles if they are to be successful. As a result, the community colleges need to continue their emphasis on the elements of effective student learning, such as a caring and supportive learning environment, recognition of prior academic preparation, teaching methods consistent with varied learning styles, realistic expectations of students, and adequate teaching resources. This emphasis has served the colleges well over their history. Student-centered initiatives are at the heart of the community college efforts.

The Board of Governors has a very specific role with regard to student success—it is charged with the leadership and coordination of the community colleges. This is accomplished through technical assistance and advocacy and should ensure accountability for results to California taxpayers and their representatives. This, in turn, means more planning and more emphasis on the outcomes of student learning and various college activities, such as out-of-class counseling.

Existing Policy

The Board of Governors will lead and coordinate the community college system through planning and policymaking and by providing technical assistance, positive incentives, and accountability in support of student success.

At present, numerous *Education Code* and Board of Governors' regulations constrain the ability of district and college faculty and staff to plan and allocate their resources in ways that most effectively improve student learning.

In *The New Basic Agenda*, a variety of initiatives are proposed that should enhance the ability of colleges to respond to student and community needs more quickly and more effectively. In addition, it appears that colleges will need to be properly accountable for achievement of educational objectives to the Legislature, Board of Governors, local boards, students, and public. In all cases, new policies and practices should be evaluated in light of their impact on student learning.

Existing Policy

Districts and colleges should be supported in their efforts to (a) respond effectively to student needs; (b) understand, articulate, and serve their communities' interests; and (c) formulate a clear vision for the effective delivery of their educational services.

Existing Policy

The Board of Governors will continue to engage in collaborative activities and joint meetings with K-12, California State University, University of California, job training agencies, and with business and industry in California and nationally.

As California's need for an educated and trained labor force, and for social stability intensify in the face of increasingly scarce public resources, it becomes more important that the many agencies involved in the state's education and training coordinate their activities and work jointly, where such measures can improve effectiveness.

Achievement of student success requires cooperative efforts by many institutions. For instance, the issue of remedial or precollegiate instruction by postsecondary institutions requires the joint efforts of community colleges along with K-12—in order to improve its work with students and thereby reduce the amount of precollegiate work required later—and with both UC and CSU in order to determine the proper amount, conduct, and location of precollegiate instruction. Similarly, essential improvements in the transfer of community college students to four-year institutions require close collaboration of the community colleges, UC, CSU, and private colleges.

Recommendations have been put forth for more effective coordination and delivery of work force preparation in California. As many as 14 state-level agencies and over two dozen major public programs are involved in this work, together with innumerable private agencies and firms. Another significant factor in the future of California work force preparation is the emerging change in federal policies about vocational education. The possible shift to block grants with far more authority for resource allocation by state agencies (like the Governor's Office), may require fundamental changes in the way California Community Colleges manage the delivery of vocational education.

It is unlikely that the community colleges can fully carry out their responsibility as California's single largest trainer for jobs—required in the shift from an industry-based to knowledge-based economy—unless the colleges coordinate their work with the many other agencies providing such services. In support of this, the Board will help the colleges in efforts to effectively partner, train, and aid in dissemination of technology for the statewide development of California's economy.

California Community Colleges offer associate degrees and certificates in more than 270 different subject categories. This may be the most diverse group of programs offered by any institution of postsecondary education. However, while extensive, it is not clear that this academic menu is effectively serving the needs of all students. When asked about their educational objectives, community colleges recently reported through the Chancellor's Office Management Information System, that students indicated the following:

29%	want to transfer with an associate degree
13%	transfer without an associate degree
10%	obtain job skills with a degree
4%	obtain job skills with a certificate
19%	obtain or upgrade job skills without a formal award
10%	obtain or upgrade basic skills
15%	are undecided

Overall, more than half of all students who say they have an educational objective do not want a degree. Nearly half of the colleges' credit enrollment in any given term is taking just 1 or 2 courses. And, one of every six students, when asked about objectives, simply indicates he or she is undecided. Two of every 5 students say they want to transfer, but, one-third of those who say this do not intend to take an associate degree. Moreover, two-thirds of those students pursuing vocational objectives do not want a degree.

Associate degrees and certificates are thoughtfully developed and evaluated, and are a valid measure of the knowledge and skills that degree-oriented students acquire at community college. These degrees may not be a valid measure, however, of the work of those students who are not degree-oriented. It appears that community college measures of student success—in both degree and non-degree efforts—are in need of review. The completion of transfer requirements, for instance, might well qualify a student for an AA degree, though it doesn't necessarily do so now. In addition, the specific job skills earned by a student in an associate degree program might be stipulated as part of that degree as a means of certifying to business and industry the specific capabilities of that student.

Issue

Degrees and certificates conferred by colleges should be reviewed to ensure that they continue to have value to students, businesses, and four-year institutions.

Issue

There should be examination of strategies that enable the colleges to more effectively identify student educational objectives, and to measure and to formally acknowledge the achievement of these objectives by students.

As suggested above, many students are undecided about their future, and have enrolled to determine their educational objectives. For them, a measure of success is their identification of specific objectives. Moreover, community colleges educate many students who have other-than-degree objectives, and who achieve those objectives, but for whom there is little or no recognition of their achievement. Thus, their added skills and knowledge, which may be quite valuable and/or "marketable," are not well documented. And, without such documentation, the college has no way of measuring the output or "educational value-added" to these many individuals.

A number of ways to solve this problem could be examined. For instance, since most students seek objectives that are not described by an "instructional program" in the college catalog, "programs" could be designed around these individual student objectives. And, once these individual programs or objectives are achieved, students would receive formal "recognition" which has currency and meaning for business and industry and others outside the college.

Student objectives often are influenced by their circumstances. Even as more young students enroll, the general profile of community college enrollment continues its gradual shift toward: more working students, and more students who are independent, often having dependents of their own, increasingly as single parents. Thus, students increasingly need courses at varying times and locations that best suit their personal schedules if they are to successfully complete their community college education. These students also need a variety of non-classroom services, including transportation and child care, at greater levels than before, to achieve success. Thus, certain nontraditional objectives should be measured and taken into account.

Issue

Measures of student performance—in acquiring skills and knowledge—should be analyzed to ensure that they are objective and that they can be and are used to improve student learning.

The difficulty in obtaining and analyzing outcome measures will continue to render their use controversial. Nevertheless, work needs to go forward in determining how best to use them in a formative way to help faculty and students improve student learning, and how best to use them in a summative way to evaluate and advertise the results of community college education.

Students enter community colleges with many differences in objectives, skills, and prior educational experiences. Accurate assessment for all students on entry can identify

individual student educational needs and clarify learning objectives. After assessment, counseling and enrollment are completed, student performance can be observed, formative evaluation conducted (where changes in objectives and activities may be made midway through a "program"), and when a student's objectives are achieved, be they one course or an associate degree, he or she could be formally recognized both for completing the academic work and for the skills and knowledge acquired. This would provide students with an explicit certification of their achievement and enable colleges to measure what they have done with and for students.

Besides recognizing individual student differences, the measurement of student learning outcomes should focus on results, not just on costs, and, as a consequence, should provide a better assessment of community college effectiveness. For instance, while increased class sizes reduce costs, they are not possible for inherently small courses like laboratories and shops. And, pedagogical improvements utilizing collaborative and performance-oriented learning may indeed lower class size and increase cost, but increase student learning substantially. Use of technologies such as television and computer-aided-instruction—that might increase productivity by increasing average class size—may be useful for students who are prepared, self-directed and motivated, but not useful for students who need personal, small group attention and group interaction.

As colleges gain experience in measuring the skills and knowledge acquired by students—an effort involving faculty, with support from educational researchers—this experience may be used to help develop reward systems which, in turn, provide incentives for college faculty and staff to engage in efforts that result in improved student performance.

One of the ways to encourage improvements in the management and delivery of community college education is through the use of positive incentives. Such incentives could provide added funding, for example, where colleges demonstrate that they have improved their performance with students. Measures of performance should acknowledge that students enter the community colleges with a wide variety of skill and experience levels. And, the improvement or progress students make toward their objectives—acquisition of skills

Issue

Incentives—through supplemental funding or other means—should be studied to see if they can help improve those college programs and services that result in superior student learning performance.

and knowledge—may be as important as is the achievement of those objectives.

The usual difficulty with such incentives, of course, is to determine how to best measure performance and how to best structure the incentive. Since community college students are so diverse in their entering skills and prior learning experiences, performance measures must in some fashion hold constant those entering differences in order to fairly assess a college's programs. Moreover, it isn't clear whether the incentive will work best by investing in poorly-performing programs to encourage (and enable) them to improve or by investing in the better-performing programs as a reward.

Issue

There should be a review of the *Education Code*, Title 5 regulations, and various guidelines so as to clarify and make more effective the directions contained therein, and to ensure that they support improved student learning.

Among the many initiatives that may be undertaken to improve student learning are efforts to clarify and make more effective the sections that direct local college planning, decision making, and delivery of education. And, this can be accomplished, while strengthening the entire system of community colleges, if many decisions now controlled by the Legislature—through statutory *Education Code* policy-making—are decentralized to the Board of Governors; and, additional decisions are further decentralized from the system-level to the local-level. Thus, management of the community college system may be strengthened, while the current balance of system- and local-control remains unchanged. This would require a significant review and revision to the *Education Code*, further changes to the Board's *Standing Orders and Procedures*, and clarification of Board guidelines.

This work is not without difficulty, but basic to all of it is the primacy of student learning. Some statutes and regulations that constrain local college flexibility exist to protect student and faculty interests and prerogatives which often are extremely important to the teaching and learning process. In other cases, provisions are designed to ensure that the interests of Californians in community colleges are protected.

Challenge

California's future depends on its community colleges meeting the expanding educational needs of its population

Despite substantial fluctuations in college enrollments, Chancellor's Office data show that California Community Colleges now enroll 67 of every 1,000 California adults—a higher rate than for any other community college system in the country. The *Master Plan* policy of "open access" to community colleges by California residents; i.e., that every high school graduate and/or those who could ". . . benefit from instruction . . ." may enroll, has been a major objective for more than thirty years.

Unfortunately, the current level of access is 15 percent below that of 1989 and one-fourth below levels recorded in the late 1970s. As noted in the Chancellor's *1993 Report on Fee Impact*, this situation is the result primarily of fee increases, course reductions (due to budget cuts), and continued impact of the funding cap since 1990. It is argued that current funding levels result in a degree of access that violates the *Master Plan* intent.

With slight possible variation, the state's emerging demography is clear. While white males have made up nearly half of the labor force in the past, minorities and females will make up fourteen of every fifteen new workers in the future. And, despite recent improvements in their enrollment, a number of the groups that make up the bulk of these new workers have been underrepresented in postsecondary education. Without improvements in the accessibility of community colleges (and postsecondary education generally) to all groups, and particularly to those groups that will comprise most of the new workers, California may be unable to educate enough skilled labor to sustain a reasonable level of economic growth into the next century.

Most of the direct cost of attending California community colleges (transportation, books and supplies, and child-care) has increased at the rate of inflation over the past two decades. The other element of student costs—fees for enrollment and other specific purposes—has increased, and when increased

Existing Policy

Open access to the community colleges should be maintained through the admission of any California resident who possesses a high school diploma or the equivalent, and the admission of any person over 18 years of age who is capable of profiting from instruction.

Existing Policy

Students who are eligible to attend a community college should not be impeded because of fees. Future changes in fees should be fair, moderate, and predictable so as to maximize educational opportunity and student success.

substantially (1984 and 1993), has had a substantial negative impact on college enrollments.

A broader examination of costs, including the job earnings that students must forego while enrolled in classes along with the costs of college instruction and support services (in the *Report on Fee Impact*) reveals that:

(1) overall, of every $10 needed to support the education of a community college student,

- students and their families contribute $7
- individual California taxpayers contribute $2
- corporate California taxpayers contribute $1

(2) because of the low cost of educating a California community college student, California taxpayers contribute less per student than do taxpayers in other states.

The benefits of educating a student at a community college cannot be accurately measured. However, there is little doubt that all Californians benefit substantially by way of the state's economic and social development to which each community college-educated individual adds.

Studies by the Chancellor's Office show that the policy of high fees-high financial aid, prevalent in community colleges in the eastern part of the United States, does not promote access. California community colleges, with a historic pattern of low fees-low aid, are four times more accessible than are community colleges in other states.

Along with a policy of moderate fees, the Board also cautions that fee revenues should add to— not substitute for— other revenues. And, the Board should have authority to set fee levels within broad parameters set by the Governor and Legislature.

Existing Policy

As student financial aid becomes increasingly important, continued support should be provided to ensure ease of application and adequate funding.

Student financial aid is becoming more important because of the socioeconomic status of California community college students. Their incomes are below those of UC and CSU students, and below the incomes of Californians generally— and the gap continues to grow. Community college students typically carry fewer classes and work more in the face of a cost or fee increase. Nearly four of every five students work.

Historically, while three of every five students would qualify for aid, only one in five applied for aid. Applications are now increasing, and the use of waivers, rather than financial aid grants, substantially improves the delivery of aid. In addition, existing grant programs—like the CalGrant—should be increased, especially in view of possible future decreases in federal student financial aid. Besides adequate funding for financial aid, it is imperative that aid be delivered in an effective and equitable way—which is possible only through application processes that do not pose an undue burden to students.

In order to meet the student demand and maximize their contribution to the economic and social development of California, community colleges will have to become more effective in both the delivery of educational services and the management of that delivery. But, improved effectiveness must consider both costs (input) and product or student performance (output).

Recent studies by the Chancellor's Office show that California community colleges deliver educational services at two-thirds the cost of community colleges in other states because California faculty teach, on average, 3 hours more per week and have as many as 10 more students per class than do faculty in colleges elsewhere. Larger classes are due in part to California's larger colleges: California community colleges average 13,000 students per college compared to less than 5,000 per college nationwide. And, California's overhead costs (for administration and plant maintenance) also are lower than in community colleges in other states.

Economic recovery and likely funding increases will enable the community colleges to improve their offerings substantially over the next decade. But, it appears that demand will still exceed college capability. One way of meeting this excess demand is to expand the use of various instructional methods such as television, computer-aided instruction, and other technologically-mediated and off-site learning experiences—where such methods demonstrate improved student access and learning, along with more efficient use of college resources. As noted by the Board's Committee on Choosing the Future, implementation of such methods will require substantial developmental work, supported by the appropriate

Existing Policy

The Board will continue to encourage the use of alternative delivery and other methods that help colleges expand their ability to instruct and serve more students.

capital investment, and with special attention to the quality of teaching, and the character and need of specific community college students.

Other ways of expanding access include joint-use and other improvements in the utilization of existing staff and facilities, as well as targeting certain individuals, such as those with low incomes, who have not continued their education to the postsecondary level, so as to remove or minimize the barriers that have prevented their enrollment in the past. Low student fees and effective financial aid are key to this effort. Another useful initiative is the "one-stop career center" where individuals have electronic access to information about all training programs available in California and where a number of different agencies are on site to advise potential students.

Issue

As districts continue to manage enrollments, they should review their practices in light of such objectives as improving the access, diversity, retention, and persistence of students.

As noted above, open access is one of the California community colleges' highest priorities. However, since 1990, colleges have had to manage or ration enrollments. Because of early registration processes, first priority is afforded to continuing students; and then, because of statute, to students in certain programs. After this, students enter the queue for classes, some of which have long waiting lists, mostly in a first-come, first-serve fashion. In the latter case, underrepresented students, for a number of reasons, tend to be at a disadvantage and often withdraw.

Predictions of high continued demand for postsecondary education and modest public revenues to support that education suggest that districts and colleges will have to continue managing their enrollments; not all those eligible to attend will be able to do so. Districts are encouraged to review the results of their enrollment management practices, including: course admission procedures and special outreach efforts; counseling practices such as comprehensive academic and career information; dissemination of student financial aid; and programs that are designed to even opportunities and eliminate disadvantages faced by students who consider enrolling in community colleges. Also of importance in this review are course scheduling practices, course add and drop dates, grading practices (including the use of Ws), probation and dismissal policies, and other academic policies.

Challenge

California Community College education must adapt to the changing educational needs of Californians so as to be relevant and timely

As set forth in the *California Education Code*, the community college "primary" priority is in degree and certificate programs in (1) lower-division arts and sciences and (2) vocational and occupational fields. Deemed as "essential and important" are remedial (precollegiate and/or basic skills) instruction, English as a Second Language (ESL), support services which help students succeed, and adult education (if it is in the "state's interest"). Community services also are "authorized, if compatible" with the above. In addition, the *Economic and Business Development Code* authorizes community colleges to engage in economic development and business training and assistance.

Community college education has been relevant and effective within this structure. But, California's culture, economy, and public needs are changing so rapidly that it seems appropriate to continually review the community college mission for its relevance and emphasis as such changes take place and as new policies are proposed.

Thirteen percent of community college instruction takes place in ESL and in the precollegiate curriculum at present. Estimates put the need at more than two times that amount. These programs should be augmented, but without endangering the emphasis and resources put to the still most important functions of transfer and vocational education. Indeed, for many students, ESL and precollegiate instruction are the building blocks on which transfer and vocational programs can be successfully based. And, the demand for ESL and precollegiate instruction should be met more cost-effectively—that is, by providing greater access without compromising the complex and substantial needs of these students.

Work should focus on aligning ESL and basic skills with transfer and vocational education to provide for an articulated system of degrees and certificates that sets clear milestones for academic accomplishments, progress toward transfer to four-year universities and colleges, and advancement on professional career ladders. Work in this area also should acknowledge the need—for ESL and basic skills—by many individuals in order to simply survive as productive citizens.

Existing Policy

The existing comprehensive mission and priorities of the community colleges provide an effective framework for change and should be maintained:

Transfer and vocational education

Remedial instruction, ESL, support services which help students succeed, and noncredit adult education

Economic development and business training and assistance

Community service

Community colleges have made substantial recent progress in training individuals for small businesses, partnering with business and industry to conduct training activities, disseminating occupational training information—through such vehicles as ED>Net—and generally supporting the state's economic development. The Board's Commission on Innovation and the Board's Committee on Choosing the Future agree that expansion of these activities requires an overall investment plan or strategy, consideration of various policies—about contract education, student fees, etc.—and ongoing support, from private as well as public organizations.

The changing nature of students and their needs means that certain support services, particularly learning resource centers, and counseling and advising—that undergird the ability of colleges to serve the individual needs of students most efficiently—are given adequate recognition as important functions. College mission statements are usually framed in terms of the end product; i.e., transfer or job placement. It is important that there also be adequate recognition of the growing role of learning resources and counseling, that essentially are the means, along with classroom instruction, for accomplishing the colleges' ends.

Issue

District and college curriculum should be predicated, to a greater degree, on the rapidly changing learning styles of students and the learning needs of a knowledge-based and increasingly multicultural society.

The continuing shift from an industrial-based to a knowledge-based society appears certain. What is not altogether clear, however, is the set of specific skills and knowledge that will best prepare community college students for the emerging work place in a rapidly changing culture.

At one level, "learning to learn" will be of major importance, including critical thinking, problem-solving, and communications skills. Students must learn how to acquire, manage, and analyze large quantities of information. The expansion of information and knowledge is proceeding at such a pace that the ability to quickly review and discard irrelevant information through the use of appropriate technologies, for instance, becomes a valued skill. At the same time, the basic reading, writing, speaking, listening, and computational skills will continue to be at the core of both transfer and occupational instruction, and students must master the levels of such skills that are consistent with their objectives.

At another level, colleges must design their vocational curricula to match expected shifts in the industrial makeup of California as well as in the specific skills needed for jobs in those industries. The effort to balance instruction appropriately between specific and general skills may shift toward the general as technological change accelerates and as the colleges find it increasingly difficult to acquire and maintain specific up-to-date equipment on which to teach. Another consequence of these conditions is that more instruction should and, presumably, will take place at the learner's worksite or, when the personal computer or other device is involved, at the learner's residence.

And, at still another—possibly the most important—level, colleges must continue the elements of their curricula and services that promote social mobility, civility, and rational discourse in the rapidly changing multicultural environment of California. The values and attitudes acquired by students in this part of the college educational mission are of major consequence to all Californians. Moreover, the ability of Californians to interact with citizens of other states and countries, particularly those along the Pacific Rim, will become increasingly important.

As the characteristics and experiences of entering students change, their learning styles change, and, therefore, college instructional approaches must change. As students come from a greater variety of cultures and backgrounds, it is likely that their learning styles will vary more widely than they did in the past. For example, some cultures emphasize competitive learning, while others emphasize cooperative learning. Teachers are held in higher esteem in some cultures than in others. The challenge of varied learning styles becomes all the more complex because the knowledge and skills students need from the community college also are becoming more, rather than less, complex.

Added to this need for more diverse individualized instructional approaches are a number of general changes in thinking about pedagogy. For example, there is increasing evidence in the literature on teaching and learning that many students learn more when they work in an "active learning" (laboratory as opposed to lecture) or in a performance-oriented setting, and when they work collaboratively, rather than competitively. In this mode, faculty facilitate learning by students, rather than solely lecture to students.

Paradoxically, the new community college student is likely to be at once both less and more prepared for postsecondary work. On the one hand, there is evidence that students generally are less prepared for traditional academic work now than were students in the past. Studies show that more than half of the students coming to community colleges are in need of some precollegiate training. And, as the colleges enroll more foreign immigrants who are limited or non-English speakers, teaching and learning become more difficult. On the other hand, most new students are more technologically-oriented than their counterparts were in the past. These new students generally will be versed in some information technologies, having developed learning styles that are heavily dependent on the graphic, rapid, and numerous "bytes" of information obtained from watching television, playing video games, and, in an increasing number of cases, from using a personal computer.

Issue

Ways to initiate and support the needed expansion of teaching with and about new technologies must be identified, including funding for the purchase of state-of-the-art instructional equipment and for professional development.

It is apparent that a student's educational experience at a community college will be increasingly valuable if he or she learns to effectively use the current information technologies. This can be accomplished by faculty teaching a wide variety of subject disciplines using such information technologies, as well as through teaching in just the specifically-identified courses such as computer science and the like.

The expansion of instructional technology likely will include, at first, telecourses (housed in local, regional, and statewide libraries) and interactive computer courseware; later, it may include more sophisticated interactive systems of voice, video, and data transmission. To date, there is little evidence that such techniques can seriously reduce costs. In fact, most experience in postsecondary education suggests that such technology can enhance quality and access, but is ambiguous about costs. Thus, it will be necessary to fund such innovations from new, rather than reallocated funds. And, as instructional technology is developed and implemented, particular attention should be paid to the varying learning styles of individual community college students.

Greater sensitivity to new and diverse learning styles and use of more technology in teaching are possible only if faculty are given adequate opportunity to learn about these issues and opportunities and have access to the technology. The

Board will continue its efforts to secure more funding of college programs that encourage innovative and developmental work on the part of faculty. In addition, a more flexible academic calendar could provide increased opportunity to engage faculty in professional development.

Maintaining the quality of the transfer function, given the expected continuing increase in student demand, requires that the college staff work to improve a series of processes that taken together enable the student to succeed in lower division and make a smooth transition to upper division.

These improvements, such as refining the core curriculum, expanding articulation agreements and establishing more consistent transfer criteria, would be undertaken in an environment of rapidly increasing demand.

At the onset of this decade, the makeup of community college enrollments—that had previously been increasingly older and more part-time—began to be younger and students began to carry heavier loads. At the same time, UC and CSU increased their fees dramatically, introducing a substantial differential between their student charges and those in community colleges. Facing budget deficits, both UC and CSU cut courses as well. The result was that many students who were eligible to attend these institutions and, in prior years would have, began their lower division work instead at a community college—reinforcing the trend toward enrollment of younger students.

Community colleges have imposed their own fee increases and course cutbacks during this decade. However, increasing numbers of younger students continue to enroll and (while cutting sections elsewhere in the curriculum) colleges have had to increase the number of course sections in mathematics, English, humanities generally, and certain sciences; i.e., in the core lower division transfer curriculum. And, still these courses are reported by most colleges to have waiting lists each term.

It is likely that current trends toward more transfer work will continue, assuming that fee and financial aid policies are maintained and assuming that the expected rapid increase in numbers of high school graduates and 18 to 24 year-olds does materialize. Of concern in this scenario is the ability of UC

Issue

The transfer of community college students needs to be strengthened by strategies such as refining the core lower division curriculum, expanding course articulation agreements, devising more common course designations, and establishing common and consistent eligibility and admissions criteria.

and CSU to handle a potential increase in community college transfer students in the latter half of this decade.

Issue

Community colleges should continue their efforts to better educate students about other cultures, societies, and economies, and to assist business and industry in becoming more competitive in the global economy.

Rapid development in global telecommunications impacts the way business is conducted and the manner in which social and political events are conceived and interpreted. The "community" in which Californians interact encompasses the entire world, not just the local geographic entity in which they live. Community colleges must ensure that their students have an understanding of world cultures and of the variations and interrelationships that exist between different cultures. Students also should be economically skilled to work and compete in a global market.

During the past decade, foreign trade has become a larger component of the nation's gross domestic product, and California has increased its share of U.S. trade. California's primary trading partners are expected to grow at a greater rate economically during the next decade than is the rest of the world. These trends, together with improvements in communications and transportation technology and continued migration, make it imperative that Californians understand the cultures, politics, economics, and values of other countries.

Community colleges have a significant role in helping promote global understanding and knowledge through a number of their programs and services, often organized under international education, or in related areas such as ethnic studies and foreign language programs. Since the inception of international education in the 1970s, community colleges have conducted it largely through study abroad and faculty ex-change programs. Recently, however, many colleges have begun to conduct programs in international staff development through contracts with colleges and universities in other countries. And, colleges have introduced a global dimension into the general education curriculum, and through international business programs and international trade development centers. But while there are a number of exemplary programs, and there has been progress in the diversity and number offered, opportunities are limited to too few colleges and many more such programs and services are needed. While community college resources will continue to be scarce, Californians should recognize that a number of college programs and services which have as their focus topics and individuals in other countries are of significant benefit to the state.

Challenge

The human and physical infrastructure of California Community Colleges must be enhanced, better organized, and better utilized

Much of the responsibility for leadership by the Board of Governors has to do with enhancing the substantial human and physical resources that comprise the community colleges infrastructure. One means of enhancing these resources is to introduce greater flexibility for resource allocation and utilization at all levels of the community college system. This requires examination of constraints contained in various codes and guidelines.

Besides the *California Education Code* and *California Code of Regulations* revisions, improved resource management and accountability may be achieved through a restructuring of the Chancellor's Office. Several objectives could be sought in this restructuring: (a) making staff responsible to the Board of Governors instead of state control agencies; (b) using expertise and resources that exist within the system for accomplishing systemwide work; (c) sharing staff with local colleges without compromising personnel benefits; (d) offering competitive staff compensation; and (e) having more flexibility to help colleges work and partner with the private sector.

Existing Policy

The Board will continue to seek ways to make the Chancellor's Office more effective.

Recent budget constraints have not only reduced community college enrollment, but also have prevented normal growth in the prices colleges pay for their human and physical resources. This price growth, typically termed a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA), has been severely curtailed during this decade.

The Board's role in college funding emphasizes obtaining an annual provision for the costs of inflation, enrollment growth, new programs, and technological and other innovations. Some of the long-term components of such costs, such as benefits for increasing numbers of retirees, are not altogether obvious. Recognition of all costs, however, is essential if the colleges are to operate more effectively over the long-term.

Existing Policy

The Board of Governors will play a continuing leadership role in advocating for adequate funding from public and private sources for the colleges.

Also important over the long-term is an effort to fill the resource gaps during periods of economic recession—when public tax revenues decline and educational demand increases—so that colleges may continue their work without severe cutbacks like those that occurred during 1991 through 1994. Alternative funding sources such as bonding and private investment may need to be developed to fill the expected revenue gaps during future recessions.

Existing Policy

The community college capital outlay planning and funding process should be streamlined and new funding sources must be developed.

While a somewhat lesser (cost) factor than human resources in the delivery of community college education, physical facilities will become increasingly important in the future for two major reasons. First, despite several years of the highest capital outlay funding in the colleges' history, facility maintenance has been budgeted at inadequate levels, and, therefore, it will become increasingly expensive to remove deferred maintenance in the future. Consequently, substandard facilities may prevent remodeling and other measures which could support increases in operating productivity.

Second, while there appears to be some excess lecture space at some colleges in the system, laboratory space is fully utilized at most colleges. However, since substantial enrollment growth is projected over the next decade, it will be necessary to expand facilities at many colleges. In order to clarify these needs in light of current and future trends, staff has started to update the Board's *Long-Range Capital Outlay Plan.*

All observers agree that college facilities can be planned and occupied more effectively if a better process of capital outlay project planning, review, approval and funding can be established. The Board will continue its efforts to streamline the capital outlay process, including an effort to remove some of the redundant review activities performed by other state-level agencies.

There is currently no stable long-term source of capital outlay funding. In recent state-level elections, general obligation bonds have been defeated, and revenue bonds must be repaid from future college operating budgets. While the Spring 1996 statewide bond issue was successful, alternative funding should be developed, including: local bond funds (to

be raised by majority vote), resumption of a state-local matching program, and greater use of private funding through partnerships and other arrangements.

Recent court opinions have questioned the legality of many affirmative action programs sponsored by public agencies. In addition, there is an initiative on the ballot in California that would constrain affirmative action programs, at least as they have been conducted in the past. Finally, the Regents of the University of California have instructed staff to develop procedures for student admissions and staff hiring that in their conduct may disregard historically under—represented minorities.

In response to these events, the Board of Governors has reaffirmed its commitment to diversity in staff hiring and to open access in student admissions. It has reviewed existing programs to ensure that practices do not violate the constitutional rights of any individuals. Based on this review and the work of a group of staff and officials from the districts and colleges, the Board recommends an affirmative action employment program for community colleges that has the following components:

1. nondiscrimination,
2. equal employment opportunity,
3. diversity, and
4. corrective action (if any practices are unconstitutional)

Debate about this topic will continue, and will require substantial attention by the Board.

Existing Policy

While affirmative action programs for staff and students help ensure that the Colleges are relevant to the changing needs and diversity of Californians, the conduct of these programs must not violate the constitutional rights of individuals.

Community college education is predominately labor-intensive or human resource-intensive. It is essential, therefore, that proper attention is paid to the hiring, development, maintenance, compensation, and overall care of its human resources. Of major importance is the professional development of staff.

Expected trends suggest there will be an increasing need for professional development that emphasizes (a) teaching methods that are effective with students with diverse and different learning styles and (b) use of technology in teaching. Budgetary constraints have limited the amount of such training available, and there is little doubt that more training would

Existing Policy

A review and possible enhancement of professional development programs in the colleges are needed to address changes in students and the ways they learn.

have a positive impact on student learning. The key will be in determining how to obtain needed funding and how to better use the academic calendar to offer professional development opportunities.

Also important to effective professional development programs is knowledge of faculty demographics. The average age of community college faculty is nearly fifty; about twice the average age of the students they teach. Consequently, large numbers of community college faculty are likely to retire during the next decade. This situation may ease cost-pressures somewhat as younger, lower-salaried faculty are hired to fill behind the higher-paid retirees. More-over, it also enables colleges, in their curricular rebuilding, to staff those programs of high and increasing priority. And, finally, it provides colleges the opportunity to employ a faculty that is more diverse and recently-trained, and, therefore, more likely to be sensitive and knowledgeable about the varied learning styles of students.

Issue

District and college decisionmaking processes should reflect, at a minimum, the spirit and intent of AB 1725 (1988).

Among its many features, AB 1725 contains specific directions about the way in which colleges are to make decisions. Each of the 71 districts continues, under AB 1725, to be governed by a locally-elected trustee board, but these boards are to establish procedures to ensure that faculty, staff, and students have the opportunity to express their opinions (at the campus level), that these opinions are given reasonable consideration, and that these groups have the right to participate effectively in district and college governance. The Board of Governors is to assist in this process by establishing minimum standards for the procedures to be adopted by local boards. In addition, academic senates are to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards.

Many changes in college decisionmaking have taken place in the six years during which these new procedures have been implemented. And, changes are still taking place as colleges continue to make the transition from older, sometimes exclusive, to newer, more inclusive, decisionmaking processes. In keeping with the intent of AB 1725 and of *The New Basic Agenda*, it is imperative that implementation of new decisionmaking procedures take place in such a way as to support improvements in student learning and student success.

Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges
1107 Ninth Street
Sacramento, California 95814-3607